

R E M A R K S

This is in response to the Office Action that was mailed on February 22, 2005. In order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have reduced the scope of claim 1, the sole independent claim in the application, by removing therefrom acids that appear to be disclosed in the prior art. No new subject matter is introduced into the claims by this Amendment. Claims 1-7 as amended are pending in the application.

On pages 2-7 of the Office Action, claims 1-7 had been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the following references: US 6,068,787 (Grumbine); US 6,436,834 (Lee) in view of Grumbine; WO 01/12740 (Cabot) in view of Grumbine; US 6,309,434 (Ohashi); US 6,585,786 (Tsuchiya) in view of Ohashi; US 2001/0049913 (Miyata); US 6,316,366 (Kaufman); and JP 7-233485 (Toshiba). Applicants do not necessarily agree that all or any of these rejections is proper with respect to all or any of claims 1-7 in their original form. Nevertheless, in the spirit of expediting the prosecution of this application, Applicants have limited the claims herein to the recitation of persulfuric acid, pyrophosphoric acid, and tripolyphosphoric acid, which are not disclosed in any of the references. Accordingly, withdrawal of the prior art rejections in question is warranted and is respectfully solicited.

On pages 8-11 of the Office Action, claims 1-7 in their original form had been rejected on the ground of obviousness-type double patenting over: SN 10/726,581 (our 1422-0613); SN 10/857,841 (our 1422-0631); SN 10 727,571 (our 1422-0611); SN 10/753,460 (our 1422-0621); US 6,620,216 (our 1422-550); and US 6,818,031. In each case, the Examiner did not allege that the applications or patents cited actually discloses or claims a composition falling within the scope of the original claims. Instead, the Examiner argued that the claims embraced compositions that are so closely related to reference compositions as to be "obvious". Applicants do not necessarily agree that all or any of the obviousness-type double patenting rejections was proper with respect to all or any of claims 1-7 in their original form. Nevertheless, in the spirit of expediting the prosecution of this application, Applicants have limited the claims herein to the recitation of persulfuric acid, pyrophosphoric acid, and tripolyphosphoric acid. Withdrawal of the obviousness-type double patenting rejections is respectfully solicited.

Conclusion


Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Richard Gallagher (Reg. No. 28,781) at the

telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
John W. Bailey, #32,881

RL
JWB/RG:gmh
1422-0595P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000